



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

Department of Design, Construction and Land Use

D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND LAND USE**

Application Numbers: 2006863

Applicant Name: Calvert Knudson

Address of Proposal: 602 36th Avenue East

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Master Use Permit for future construction of a cluster housing development, which would add one (1) new single family dwelling unit. To subdivide one (1) parcel of land into two (2) parcels of land in an environmentally critical area. Approximately 600 cubic yards of grading is proposed. Existing dwelling is to remain.

The following approvals are required:

Short Plat - to divide one parcel of land into two parcels of land. (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.24)

Environmentally Critical Areas Conditional Use - to recover development credit in a designated ECA. (SMC Chapter 25.09.260)

SEPA - Environmental Determination - (SMC Chapter 25.05)

SEPA DETERMINATION:

☐ Exempt ☐ DNS ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☒ DNS with conditions

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition, or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND DATA

The site is located in-between the Madison park neighborhood and Madrona neighborhood just above Hillside Drive East and McGilvra Boulevard East. The site is zoned Single Family 7200 (SF 7200). The site has steep slope and landslide-prone environmentally critical areas (ECA). A natural bench is located on the lower edge of the slope which is the proposed area for a single family house. There are a number of substantial trees on the property, including a 30-inch diameter maple. Access will be via Hillside Drive E which is improved with curbs and gutters. Pedestrian circulation along the property is substantially impeded by the slope and overgrowth. There is a history of landslides on this property and in the area.

Proposal

The proposal is to divide one parcel of land into two parcels of land. Parcel A would be 16,407 square feet and Parcel B would be 10,894 square feet. Parcel A has an existing single family home and new single family house is proposed on parcel B.

Public Comment

Three letters were received during the official public comment period which ended August 8, 2001. Two letters expressed no objection to the project, but served to alert the planner of slides on and near the property in recent years. A third letter expressed concern that tree and vegetation removal would not be in the public interest.

ANALYSIS - SHORT SUBDIVISION

SMC Section 23.24.040 provides that the Director shall use the following criteria to determine whether to grant, condition, or deny a short plat application:

1. *Conformance to the applicable Land Use Policies and Land Use Code provisions;*
2. *Adequacy of access for vehicles, utilities, and fire protection, as provided in Chapter 23.53;*
3. *Adequacy of drainage, water supply, and sanitary sewage disposal;*
4. *Whether the public use and interests are served by permitting the proposed division of land; and*
5. *Conformance to the applicable provisions of SMC Section 25.09.240, short subdivisions and subdivisions in environmentally critical areas.*
6. *Is designed to maximize the retention of existing trees;*

7. *Conformance to the provisions of Section 23.24.045, Unit lot subdivisions, when the short subdivision is for the purpose of creating separate lots of record for the construction and/or transfer of title of townhouses, cottage housing, clustered housing, or single family housing.*

Based on information provided by the applicant, referral comments and information supplied by the Seattle Transportation, Seattle Water District, Seattle Fire Department, and Seattle City Light, the following findings are made with respect to the above-cited criteria:

1. The proposed lots meet the minimum size requirements set forth in the Land Use Code. The house as conditioned will be required to meet development standards as adjusted to account for constraints present on the site. Thus, the proposed short subdivision will conform to the Land Use Code.
2. As conditioned, one lot would continue to use an exiting driveway off 36th Avenue East, outside any ECA, and the other would take access off of Hillside Drive East. Code-complying parking can be provided on site. The Seattle Fire Department and Seattle City Light approved the short plat. Neither had any comments on or requirements for the proposal. There will be adequate access to the lots for off-street parking, vehicles, utilities, and fire protection.
3. The Seattle Public Utilities issued Water Availability Certificate No. 01-0831 indicating that the water supply and the existing fire hydrant are adequate. A storm water detention system will be required for any new development. The existing structure located on proposed Lot A is connected by means of a single side sewer to an 8-inch public combined sewer (PS) located in 36th Ave. E. There is an 8-inch Public Sewer available to serve Lot B in Hillside Drive East. This mainline was originally installed as a combined sewer, and there are likely to be downspouts and area drains still connected to what is now considered, for purposes of new development, a sanitary sewer. In addition, DCLU will require, as a condition of approval of any construction permit, a drainage control plan. There will be adequate drainage, water supply, and sanitary sewage disposal.
4. The purpose of the Single Family (SF) zone land use policies is to preserve and maintain the physical character of SF residential areas in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the City. The public interests are served by permitting the proposed division of land, in that more housing will be provided inside the City, and in that the proposed single family houses conform to the intentions for the zone. The existing stairway belonging to the residence to the north will be allowed under a separate recorded easement and is a condition of approval as described below. The proposal is, additionally, in keeping with the existing character of the vicinity.
5. The short plat must conform to the applicable provisions of SMC Section 25.09.240, short subdivisions and subdivisions in environmentally critical areas. All short subdivision and subdivision proposals located in riparian corridor buffers, wetlands and wetland buffers, and steep slopes (over forty percent (40%)) shall comply with the

following specified development standards in addition to the standards set forth in Subtitle III, Platting Requirements, of SMC Title 23, Land Use Code:

The applicant has applied for an administrative conditional use permit to recover development credit on this site. The analysis for that review follows.

6. Is designed to maximize the retention of existing trees.

Some trees may be lost due to necessary slope stabilization. Provided the plat is conditioned to prevent removal of trees for view enhancement purposes, the proposal maximizes the retention of trees.

7. Conformance to the provisions of Section 23.24.045, Unit lot subdivisions, when the short subdivision is for the purpose of creating separate lots of record for the construction and/or transfer of title of townhouses, cottage housing, clustered housing, or single family housing.

This is not a unit lot subdivision.

DECISION - SHORT SUBDIVISION

The proposed short plat application is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

CONDITIONS - SHORT SUBDIVISION

(Following SEPA review.)

ANALYSIS - Administrative conditional use to recover development credit and permit clustered development on-site in a single family zone.

Section 23.42.042 of the Seattle Land Use Code authorizes review of conditional use permits according to the procedures set forth in Chapter 23.76, Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions. Section 25.09.260 of the ECA ordinance sets forth the review criteria for Administrative Conditional Use Permits [ACU] to recover development credit and permit clustered development in single family zones. Applicable review criteria and supporting analysis follows:

- A. Up to full development credit on-site (determined by calculating the maximum number of lots allowed based on the underlying single family zoning and size of the originating property) may be granted by the Director through an administrative conditional use permit, authorized under SMC Section 23.42.042, Conditional uses, in the Land Use Code.

The minimum lot size in this zone is 7,200 square feet. The number of new lots proposed by this application is two. When the critical area and buffer are subtracted from the total lot area in calculating development credit, as required by SMC Section 25.09.240 D, not enough square feet of non-critical lot area remains as required for two lots. Thus, the existing lot cannot meet the development standards for a short subdivision contained in SMC Section 25.09.240. However, the conditional use provisions of Section 25.09.260, which incorporate the critical areas policies, allow recovery of development credit and reduction of yards through clustering as an alternative to strict application of Section 25.09.240 D. The applicant has therefore applied for an ECA administrative conditional use to “recover” sufficient development credit to allow a short subdivision into two new lots. The 27,301 square foot site is encumbered by a steep slope area approximately 10,545 square feet in area. Thus, approximately 10,000 square feet of the property is “off-limits” for development, representing a loss of dwelling unit count of approximately 3 houses. The proponent requests approval of only one house located mostly outside of the steep slopes; thus, leaving area to stabilize, preserve and enhance the ECA on site.

SMC Section 25.09.260A allows recovery of development credit on a parcel of property provided that the criteria in that section are met.

Discussion of the criteria in subsection E (1-9) is followed by analysis of the clustering provisions of subsections F, G and H, and then by analysis of the general conditional use criteria of subsections B and C. Subsection D requires that DCLU issue written findings of fact and conclusions to support its decision.

E. The Director may approve the transfer of development credit if it can be shown that the development would meet the following conditions and findings:

1. *The transfer of development credit shall not result in any significant increase of negative environmental impacts, including erosion, on the identified ECA and its buffer;*

Development on the proposed new lot will occur mostly within the somewhat level area at the base of the slope. Proposed development, including the construction area, would need to disturb no designated steep slope area that is not exempt from ECA Steep Slope disturbance limits. A portion of the steep slope may be disturbed in order to stabilize the existing slope. Limitation of land disturbing activity will be a condition of approval of the proposed development, as will the designation of the critical area buffer on the proposed lot as a non-disturbance area by ECA covenant. The applicant has indicated that an erosion control plan will be submitted with the building permit application for the proposed new house. Submittal of the erosion control plan will be a condition to be met prior to issuance of the building permit. Development would be subject to the adopted Seattle Storm water, Grading and Drainage Control Code. Thus, the transfer of development credit would not likely result in any significant increase of negative environmental impacts.

2. *The development shall be reasonably compatible with neighborhood characteristics. This shall include but not be limited to concerns such as height, bulk, scale, yards, pedestrian environment, and amount of vegetation remaining;*

The existing neighborhood is single family homes with one or two car garages. The proposal is for one new single family home with garage. Proposed height meets development standards for this zone. Lot size is consistent with other lots in the area. No adverse change to the pedestrian environment is anticipated.

3. *In no case shall development credit be allowed for the area covered by an open water area of a wetland or riparian corridor.*

There are no open water areas on the site.

4. *The development shall retain and protect vegetation on designated undisturbed areas on and off site. Significant species or stands of trees shall be protected, and tree removal shall be minimized. Replacement and establishment of trees and vegetation shall be required where it is not possible to save trees.*

Trees will be protected and retained wherever possible. Since some trees will be cut down for the development footprint, replacement trees will be required. Any disturbed areas will be replanted with appropriate native plants. Tree removal in steep slope areas for the purpose of view enhancement will not be permitted.

5. *The ability of natural drainage systems to control the quality and quantity of storm water runoff shall not be significantly impaired.*

The proposal would not likely significantly impair the ability of natural drainage systems to control the quality and quantity of storm water runoff. Where natural drainage systems are evolving to mass wasting, control measure will be contemplated for slope stabilization through geotechnical design and review.

6. *The development shall not adversely affect water quality and quantity, erosion potential, drainage, and slope stability of other ECA located in the same drainage basin.*

The development would not likely adversely affect water quality and quantity, erosion potential, drainage, and slope stability of other ECA located in the same drainage basin. Erosion potential should be reduced through control measures to stabilize the slope and to control the quality and quantity of storm water runoff. While the proposed development presents some risk of erosion during construction, the development must conform to the requirements of the Storm water, Grading and Drainage Control regulations. An erosion and sediment control plan for the property employing Best Management Practices as outlined in DCLU Director's Rule 16-00 will be required for the project. If constructed in conformity to City regulations and Best Management Practices, the development

will not adversely affect water quality, erosion, drainage, or slope stability. The sixth criterion is therefore satisfied.

7. *The development's site plan shall include measures to minimize potential negative effects of the development on the undeveloped portion of the site, including provision of natural barriers.*

The proposed development, at the building permit stage, is subject to the following ECA requirements: dry season grading; the preparation of a detailed construction schedule; approved temporary and permanent erosion control plans; a comprehensive drainage control plan or alternative as determined by DCLU plan review at the time of a building permit application; ECA covenants; bonds; insurance; a non-disturbance fence; adherence to geotechnical recommendations for development, and a pre-construction meeting.

The proposed residence will limit disturbance on the site. A non-disturbance area will be set aside except for slope stabilization through separate permits.

8. *Adequate infrastructure (streets and utilities) shall be available or will be provided.*

Adequate infrastructure is available at Hillside Drive East.

9. *The site design guidelines of Section 25.09.180C shall be followed for designated steep-slope areas.*

Section 25.09.180 C 1 states that "Structures should be designed and placed on the hillside to minimize negative impacts, such as grading and land disturbing activity." But certain steep slopes may be exempted from the steep slope regulations upon the Director's determination, based on geotechnical expertise, that application of the regulations would prevent necessary stabilization of a landslide-prone area. (SMC 25.09 180 D5) The proposal will have the house foundation built partially into the steep to aid in slope stabilization. The Director determines that third party review is not necessary for this determination. The project will be designed to maximize use of the non steep slope area on the property. The area receiving the exemption is limited to the restoration area indentified on sheet 3/8 of the MUP set and indicted as the rock buttress area.

In addition to the above criteria, SMC Section 25.09.260.B requires a finding that the proposed use will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property in the zone or vicinity in which the property is located. Based on the analysis above and mitigation required below, a finding of no material detriment is supported.

- F. *The Director may approve more than one (1) dwelling unit per lot and may approve smaller than required lot sizes and yards to accommodate recovery of development credit, and to encourage larger buffers, reduce impermeable surfaces, and decrease size*

of affected areas. . . Full development credit on-site shall not be increased beyond that permitted by the underlying single family zone.

SMC Section 25.09.260.F authorizes the Director to approve smaller yards than ordinarily required in order to accommodate recovery of development credit and to encourage larger buffers, reduce impermeable surfaces, and decrease size of affected areas. In order to develop a second house on the lot without encroaching on to the regulated steep slope or steep slope buffer, the applicant can propose reduced yards. All other development standards will be met. The reduced yard is reasonable in order to avoid disturbance to the regulated steep slope critical area. Full development credit on the existing lot, which has a total of 27,301 square feet of area, would be at least three houses, so the proposal to construct one new house does not increase development credit on the site beyond what is permitted by the underlying zoning.

G. The Director may require that structures be located on the site in order to preserve or enhance topographical conditions, adjacent uses and the layout of the project and to maintain a compatible scale and design with the surrounding community. In order to approve clustered dwelling units in all environmentally critical areas, the following criteria shall be met:

1. *Clustering of units shall help to protect the following critical areas: riparian corridors, wetlands and steep slopes;*
2. *Clustering of units shall require siting of structures to minimize disturbance of the environment;*
3. *Clustering of units shall help to protect priority species or stands of mature trees;*
4. *Clustering of units shall ensure maximum retention of topographic features;*
5. *Clustering of units shall limit location of access and circulation to maximize the protection of an area's natural character and environmental resource;*
6. *Clustering of units shall help protect the visual continuity of natural greenery, tree canopy, and wildlife habitat;*
7. *Clustering of units shall not have an adverse impact on the character, design and scale of the surrounding neighborhood; and*
8. *Clustering of units shall promote expansion, restoration or enhancement of a riparian corridor and its buffer, a wetland and its buffer or a steep-slope area and its buffer.*

Most of the clustering criteria have been discussed in the analysis of the recovery of development credit. The subject cluster will protect the steep slope area on the site by concentrating most of the proposed new developmental coverage outside of the critical area. By concentrating the new development on the level portion of the site, with no removal of

significant trees, the project minimizes disturbance of the environment and will not impact the steep slope. Although the proposal involves removal of some trees in the non-critical area of the property, as well as some lesser plants, the proposal does not otherwise involve any loss of existing trees on the site. The proposal will generally retain the existing topographic features. Access and circulation will be from a presently dedicated street right-of-way. Although some additional impervious surface will be added in the non-critical portion, it is well within the lot coverage limits of the Land Use Code. Thus, the development as proposed will not affect the area's natural character and environmental resources.

By limiting development to the level area in the westerly part of the property, and preserving trees and vegetation on site, the proposal suitably protects the visual continuity of natural greenery, tree canopy, and wildlife habitat. As previously described, the two houses are of comparable size and footprint to many other houses in the immediate neighborhood, and will therefore not have an adverse impact on neighborhood character, design or scale. The location of proposed development within the non-critical easterly part of the existing lot represents the best area for construction, while minimizing grading or other land disturbing activity.

H. Additional Conditional Use Provisions for Steep Slopes and Steep-slope Buffers.

1. *In steep-slope areas and their buffers, the Director may allow clustering on the steep-slope portions of the site when the site is predominantly characterized by steep slopes. However, the preference shall be to cluster away from steep-slope and buffer areas.*
2. *The Director shall require clear and convincing evidence that the clustering criteria and findings of this subchapter are met when a transfer in development credit within a steep-slope area is also characterized by or adjacent to:*
 - a. *A wetland over fifteen hundred (1,500) square feet in size, or a stream or creek designated as a riparian corridor; or*
 - b. *A large (over five (5) acres) undeveloped steep-slope system; or*
 - c. *Areas designated by the Washington Department of Wildlife as urban natural open space habitat areas or areas with significant tree cover providing valuable wildlife habitat.*

All proposed development except for slope stabilization will occur on the non-critical portion of the lot. Criterion H.1 is satisfied. Criterion H.2 (a-c) is not applicable, since none of the features described are present on the lots.

- B. The Director may approve, condition or deny an application for an administrative conditional use. The Director's decision shall be based on a determination of whether the proposed transfer of development credit within the site meets the criteria for allowing the specific conditional use and whether the use will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property in the zone or vicinity in which the property is located.

As discussed above, the proposed transfer of development credit and clustering within the site meets the conditional use criteria for approval. As proposed, and subject to the conditions of approval of this decision and the requirements of other codes and ordinances, the development would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property in the zone or vicinity in which the lot is located.

- C. In authorizing an administrative conditional use, the Director may mitigate adverse negative impacts by imposing requirements and conditions deemed necessary for the protection of other properties in the zone or vicinity in which the property is located.

Conditions have been included to mitigate potential adverse negative impacts. These conditions are set forth following the short subdivision and SEPA analysis below.

CONDITIONS - ECA conditional use to recover development credit and permit clustered development.

See below, following SEPA analysis.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the annotated environmental checklist dated March 12, 2001, and the considerable supplemental information in the project file and attached notebook. This information, along with the experience of the lead agency in similar situations, form the basis for this analysis and decision. Short- and long-term adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665.D) states *"where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation,"* subject to limitations. Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Storm water, Grading and Drainage Control Ordinance (grading, site excavation and soil erosion); Street Use Ordinance (watering streets to suppress dust, obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way during construction, construction along the street right-of-way, and sidewalk repair); Building Code (construction standards); and Noise Ordinance (construction noise). Compliance with these codes and ordinances will be adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of identified adverse impacts. Thus, mitigation pursuant to SEPA is not necessary for these impacts. Other short-term impacts not noted here as mitigated by codes, ordinances or conditions (e.g., increased traffic during construction, additional parking demand generated by construction personnel and equipment, increased use of energy and natural resources) are not sufficiently adverse to warrant further mitigation.

Short-term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: decreased air quality due to increased dust and other suspended air particulate during construction; potential soil erosion during grading, excavation and general site work; increased runoff; tracking of mud onto adjacent streets by construction vehicles; increased demand on traffic and parking from construction equipment and personnel; conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources. Due to the temporary nature and limited scope of these impacts, they are not considered significant (SMC Section 25.05.794). Although not significant, these impacts are adverse.

Construction noise may be adverse enough to warrant mitigation. The proximity of residential uses is such that the limitations of the Noise Ordinance would be inadequate to mitigate potential noise impacts. Pursuant to SEPA policies in SMC Section 25.05.675.B, the hours of excavation, foundation installation and framing activity shall be limited to between 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on non-holiday weekdays to mitigate noise impacts. Some extraordinary activities may require occasional weekend and evening work. If such work is planned a request should be submitted in writing to the DCLU planner (Holly Godard 615-1254) and should be requested prior to each occurrence.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated from the proposal: increased surface water runoff from greater site coverage by increased impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic and parking demand due to residents and visitors; minor increase in airborne emissions resulting from additional traffic; increases in ambient noise due to increased human activity; increased demand on public services and utilities; increased light and glare; loss of vegetation; and increased energy consumption. These long-term impacts are not expected to be significant.

Except as discussed in the ECA conditional use analysis above, the expected long-term impacts are typical of a single family residential development and are expected to be mitigated by the City's adopted codes and/or ordinances (together with fulfillment of Seattle Transportation requirements). Specifically these are: the Storm water, Grading and Drainage Control Ordinance (storm water runoff from additional site coverage by impervious surface); the Land Use Code (aesthetic impacts, height, setbacks, parking); and the Seattle Energy Code (long-term energy consumption). Specific impacts to steep slopes would be mitigated by compliance with conditions set forth in accordance with the ECA Ordinance (conditional use analysis and conditions imposed above).

Other impacts not noted here as mitigated by codes or conditions (earth/soils, increased ambient noise, increased traffic, increased demand on public services and utilities, increased airborne emissions, increased light and glare, loss of vegetation) are not sufficiently adverse to warrant further mitigation by condition.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).
- [] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

CONDITIONS - SHORT SUBDIVISION

Conditions of Approval Prior to Recording

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall:

1. Submit the recording fee and final recording forms for approval. See changes suggested by the Land Use Technician and reconcile the changes to the technician's satisfaction.
2. Have final recording documents prepared by or under the supervision of a Washington State licensed land surveyor. Each lot, parcel or tract created by the short subdivision shall be surveyed in the field and all property corners set in conformance with appropriate State statutes. The property corners set shall be identified on the plat and encroachments such as side yard easements, fences or structures shall be shown. Existing structures including retaining walls and their distances to the proposed property lines shall be shown. Either reuse contours to reflect existing conditions or delineate slope revision area approved under Permit #731047. Add all conditions following approval to the face of the plat or on a separate page as directed. If the conditions are on a separate page, insert on the plat "*For conditions of approval after recording see page ____ of ____.*" If necessary, renumber the pages.
3. In order to maximize retention of trees, show on the plat trees that were proposed to be removed for view enhancement as being retained.
4. The existing stairway belonging to the residence to the north will be allowed under a separate recorded easement and is a condition of approval as described below.
5. The owner and/or responsible party shall prepare and submit an ECA covenant that restricts development to areas outside of exempt steep slope area per SMC 25.09.240. Designate covenanted non-disturbance area(s) on the final plat.

Conditions of Approval Prior to Issuance of Any Construction Permits for Either Proposed Parcel

6. The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall attach a copy of the recorded short plat to the construction permit plans.

CONDITIONS - ECA conditional use to recover development credit and permit clustered development and ECA exceptions:

Prior to issuance of the Master Use Permit

7. View enhancement tree clearing should not be associated with vegetation management plans for the stabilization program (clearing of trees northeast of the proposed development are for view enhancement). Remove references to removing those trees and label as trees to be retained.

Prior to issuance of the Building Permit

8. A vegetation enhancement program must be developed that identifies specified trees that must be removed from the vicinity of the house, and vegetation to replace the root systems of the trees and other vegetation that will be removed. The program must be developed by a landscape professional with recommendations from the geotechnical engineer. Address tree retention down slope to the northeast of the proposed development which were proposed to be removed for view enhancement clearings. Also address the area of the rock buttress. Vegetation modifications in street right-of-way must be coordinated with Seattle Department of Transportation.
9. The vegetation management plan for the stabilization project must be prepared by qualified landscape professional or silvaculturalist as recommended in the geotechnical submittals, and the vegetation plan must be reviewed/approved by the geotechnical engineer. Replacement trees should replace root systems, as required for surficial soil stability.
10. Vegetation of the buttress area needs to be addressed and shown on plans prior to issuance of building/grading permits. These plans must be reviewed by DCLU's Wetland Planner. Note that it may be difficult to vegetate a rock buttress; the submittal by Shannon & Wilson (reference f.) recommended that Seattle Type 17 fill should be considered-this fill will enable establishment of vegetation more readily than the rock fill.

For the life of the project

11. The stabilizing buttress must retain 2 feet of freeboard needed for landslide debris catchment.

CONDITIONS - SEPA

None.

Signature: _____ (signature on file) Date: July 28, 2003

Holly J. Godard, Land Use Planner
Department of Design, Construction and Land Use
Land Use Services

HJG:vr

H:\projects\acu\2006863\2006863 new decision 6-03.doc